

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/612,545	5 07/01/2003		Stephen M. Dershem	QUANT1280-2 (028248-1704)	3581
30542	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER		INER
FOLEY & I		ER	ASINOVSKY, OLGA		
P.O. BOX 80278 SAN DIEGO, CA 92138-0278				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			1711	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/612,545	DERSHEM ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Olga Asinovsky	1711
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we really received by the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Description</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This allower closed in accordance with the practice under Experimental Experimental Experimental Control of the Process of the Proces	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-42 is/are pending in the application Papers 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-42 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and are subjected to by the Examine 10).	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application of the second state of the second state of the second se	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	•	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>August 25, 2003</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

The cancellation of claim 2 is noted.

The rejection of claims 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lipian et al U.S. patent 6,455,650 is withdrawn. The applicants' argument that Lipian discloses a process for polymerizing polycycloolefin monomers in the presence of high activity Group 10 catalyst system is persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-22 and 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lipian et al U.S. patent 6,455,650=WO 00/20472...

The rejection is set forth at pages 3-4 on the office action mailed on 09/24/2004 and it is incorporated here by reference.

3. Applicant's arguments filed Dec 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The present claims is a heterobifunctional monomer composition that is polymerizable in the presence of any catalyst. Lipian discloses a polymerizable polycycloolefin composition. The polycycloolefin monomers represented by the

Art Unit: 1711

chemical structures VII and VII(a) at column 30 and column 32 are readable in the present claims for being a polymerizable heterobifunctional monomer in the present claims. The heterobifunctional monomer having a maleimide moiety is readable3 in applicants' claim 6.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 5. Claims 1-42 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,780.
- 6. The rejection is set forth at pages 2-3 of the office action mailed on 09/24/2004 and it is incorporated here by reference. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-37 discloses a heterobifunctional monomer having the chemical structure that is readable in the present claims. The plurality of heterobifunctional monomers are polymerizing for

Art Unit: 1711

producing a polymer block copolymer, wherein said polymer and block copolymer are analogous to the present claimed polymer and block copolymer. Claims 1-37 in Patent '780 also disclose a method for synthesizing heterobifunctional monomers and a method for producing a polymer having a hyterobifunctional monomer by using a Ziegler-type catalyst. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the functional groups in the present claims for being the same as cited in claims 1-37 of Patent'780, and, thereby, obtain the same heterobifunctional monomer and a polymer produced from the same polymerizable monomer.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga Asinovsky whose telephone number is 571-272-1066. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 31, 2005

Olga Asinovsky Examiner Art Unit 1711

James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700